

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
NASHVILLE DIVISION

| | | |
|------------------------------|---|--------------------|
| WILLIAM DAVIDSON HAMBY, JR., |) | |
| |) | |
| Plaintiff |) | |
| |) | No. 3:12-1296 |
| v. |) | Judge Sharp/Bryant |
| |) | |
| BETH GENTRY; DARON HALL, |) | |
| |) | |
| Defendants |) | |

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

Plaintiff Hamby, a prisoner proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis*, has filed two motions to compel discovery (Docket Entry Nos. 42 and 52).

These two motions suffer from the same fatal shortcomings as other similar motions previously filed by Plaintiff Hamby. For this reason, these motions must be DENIED.

Local Rule 37.01, which governs discovery motions, requires, among other things, that any motion to compel discovery quote verbatim each interrogatory, request for admissions, or request for production of documents upon which the motion to compel is based. In addition, this same local rule requires that any response as well as the grounds for any objection by a responding party must also be included in the motion.

Although Plaintiff Hamby asserts in his motion (Docket Entry No. 42 at 1) that he has served upon defense counsel a request for production of documents, a request for admissions, and a subpoena, Plaintiff Hamby has failed to comply with the local

rules requiring him to state verbatim each request for production or request for admissions for which he seeks relief from the Court, as well as any response or objection served by Defendants. In the absence of this information, the undersigned Magistrate Judge is unable to determine whether Plaintiff Hamby's motions to compel have merit.

For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiff's motions to compel (Docket Entry Nos. 42 and 52) are **DENIED**.

It is so **ORDERED**.

/s/ John S. Bryant
JOHN S. BRYANT
United States Magistrate Judge